

REMARKS

The Examiner rejects claims 32, 37, 38 and 57 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Gnuechtel in view of Keel.

Claim 32 clearly distinguishes at least by reciting the frame being pivotal about a first axis and the frame also being pivotal about a second axis of rotation parallel to a movement direction of the web between the first and additional positionable rolls with an actuated adjustment device that is actuated by at least one of the functions selected from the group consisting of manually, electrically, hydraulically, and pneumatically, to make said edge of the web rigid to prevent sagging. This language is similar to language in previous now cancelled dependent claim 34 and is also based on the specification disclosure at substitute specification page 9, lines 8-12. By rotating the frame about the axis of rotation 58 with the actuation device the web is made rigid to prevent sagging.

The primary reference Gnuechtel does not have any second axis of rotation for his frame. For this deficiency, the Examiner cites the secondary reference of Keel. Keel shows in Figs. 2A, 2B and 2C a *freely* tiltable pair of rollers 710, 720. Very significantly, as disclosed at column 4, lines 64-67 and column 5, lines 1-20, the tilting guide 700 *is not activated by an actuated adjustment device but rather simply leans* based on non-uniform tension in the film. There is no actuating device to actuate the tilting. Therefore, it would not tighten the web to make it rigid to prevent sagging. Therefore, Keel teaches directly away from the invention of claim 32 which utilizes an actuated adjustment device.

The dependent withdrawn claims 33 and 35-51 should all be allowed in view of the allowability of the generic linking claim 32. They also recite additional features

not suggested when combined with the features of claim 32. Withdrawn claim 36 was amended for consistency in the event it is allowed.

Claim 57 was amended in a fashion similar to claim 32 and is also allowable for the reason noted with respect to claim 32. Dependent withdrawn claims 58 and 59 should also be allowed as being dependent on the allowable linking claim 57. These claims also recite additional features not suggested.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

Patent Department - **CUSTOMER NO. 26574**

6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 258-5786

Attorneys for Applicant